

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/US2009/036965	International filing date (day/month/year) 12.03.2009	Priority date (day/month/year) 14.03.2008	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC INV. A61K9/14 A61K31/565			
Applicant ELAN PHARMA INTERNATIONAL LTD.			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:  European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Date of completion of this opinion see form PCT/ISA/210	Authorized Officer Giménez Miralles, J Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8655
--	--	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2009/036965

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 the international application in the language in which it was filed
 a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. **type of material:**
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. **format of material:**
 on paper
 in electronic form
 - c. **time of filing/furnishing:**
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US2009/036965

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of

the entire international application
 claims Nos. 1-86 in part

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):

the claims, or said claims Nos. 1-86 in part are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):
see separate sheet

no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 1-86 in part

a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:
 furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
 furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.
 pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13ter.1(a) or (b).

a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See Supplemental Box for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2009/036965

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
 - paid additional fees
 - paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
 - paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
 - not paid additional fees
2. This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
 - complied with
 - not complied with for the following reasons:
see separate sheet
4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
 - all parts.
 - the parts relating to claims Nos.

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-86</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-86</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-53</u>
	No: Claims	<u>54-86</u>

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.
PCT/US2009/036965

Re Item III

See International search report (ISR), Box II.2 and Further Information sheet PCT/ISA/210.

Re Item IV

The ISA considers that the international application does not comply with the requirement of unity of the invention as set forth in Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 PCT for the following reasons:

The inventive concept of formulating an antiangiogenic agent in stabilized nanoparticulate (nanocrystalline) dispersion wherein the nanoparticles have effective average particle size of less than 2000 nm and comprise a surface stabilizer associated therewith is not novel (see documents D1 to D5 cited in the ISR). Therefore, lack of unity arises as each single angiogenesis inhibitor as defined in claim 2 represents a separate invention, the multiple inventions covered by claim 2 not sharing any special technical feature(s) making a novel and inventive contribution over the prior art within the meaning of Rule 13.2 PCT.

Re Item V

1. The relevant prior art documents are referred to as D1 to D9 as in the order of appearance in the International Search Report (ISR). Unless otherwise indicated, reference is made to the passages of said documents cited in the ISR.
2. Citations and explanations supporting the statement with regard to novelty (N), inventive step (IS) and industrial applicability (IA) (Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) and (b) PCT):
(N) The subject-matter of claims 1, 34 and 54 is not novel because it is anticipated by the prior art (Article 33(2) PCT).
D1-D5 anticipate solid nanoparticulate dispersions of angiogenesis inhibitors (2-methoxyestradiol, tamoxifen, medroxyprogesterone, paclitaxel, thalidomide, etc.) having effective average particle size of less than 2000 nm, and a non-crosslinked polymeric surface stabilizer adsorbed onto / associated with the surface of the

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2009/036965

nanoparticles, in particular polymers such as HPC, HPMC, copovidonum, etc. In particular, D1 and D2 anticipate exactly same subject-matter as claimed in present claims. Accordingly, nothing new can be seen in the subject-matter of present application.

- (IS) The subject-matter of claims 1, 34 and 54 is not considered to involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the reasons mentioned above.
- (IA) The subject-matter of claims 1-53 is considered to be industrially applicable (Article 33(4) PCT). The possibility of industrial application is beyond any doubt. The subject-matter of claims 54-86 is not considered to be industrially applicable as it cannot be used in "industry" as defined in the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (Article 33(4) PCT).

3. Reservation statement regarding patentability:

The patentability of claims to methods of medical treatment (present claims 54-86) can be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognise as patentable claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow claims to a product, in particular substances or compositions for use in a first or further medical treatment.

Possible steps after receipt of the international search report (ISR) and written opinion of the International Searching Authority (WO-ISA)

General information	For all international applications filed on or after 01/01/2004 the competent ISA will establish an ISR. It is accompanied by the WO-ISA. Unlike the former written opinion of the IPEA (Rule 66.2 PCT), the WO-ISA is not meant to be responded to, but to be taken into consideration for further procedural steps. This document explains about the possibilities.
Amending claims under Art. 19 PCT	Within 2 months after the date of mailing of the ISR and the WO-ISA the applicant may file amended claims under Art. 19 PCT directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. The PCT reform of 2004 did not change this procedure. For further information please see Rule 46 PCT as well as form PCT/ISA/220 and the corresponding Notes to form PCT/ISA/220.
Filing a demand for international preliminary examination	<p>In principle, the WO-ISA will be considered as the written opinion of the IPEA. This should, in many cases, make it unnecessary to file a demand for international preliminary examination. If the applicant nevertheless wishes to file a demand this must be done before expiry of 3 months after the date of mailing of the ISR/ WO-ISA or 22 months after priority date, whichever expires later (Rule 54bis PCT). Amendments under Art. 34 PCT can be filed with the IPEA as before, normally at the same time as filing the demand (Rule 66.1 (b) PCT).</p>
	<p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is filed and no comments/amendments have been received the WO-ISA will be transformed by the IPEA into an IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) which would merely reflect the content of the WO-ISA. The demand can still be withdrawn (Art. 37 PCT).</p>
Filing informal comments	<p>After receipt of the ISR/WO-ISA the applicant may file informal comments on the WO-ISA directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. These will be communicated to the designated Offices together with the IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) at 30 months from the priority date. Please also refer to the next box.</p>
End of the international phase	<p>At the end of the international phase the International Bureau of WIPO will transform the WO-ISA or, if a demand was filed, the written opinion of the IPEA into the IPRP, which will then be transmitted together with possible informal comments to the designated Offices. The IPRP replaces the former IPER (international preliminary examination report).</p>
Relevant PCT Rules and more information	<p>Rule 43 PCT, Rule 43bis PCT, Rule 44 PCT, Rule 44bis PCT, PCT Newsletter 12/2003, OJ 11/2003, OJ 12/2003</p>